

Attachment TLM-1

Curriculum Vita of Terry L. Murray

Terry L. Murray**President, Murray & Cratty, LLC****January 1998 - present**

Economic consulting and expert witness testimony specializing in regulatory and antitrust matters.

Principal, Murray and Associates**April 1992 - December 1997**

Economic consulting and expert witness testimony, primarily in the fields of telecommunications, energy and insurance regulation and antitrust.

Director, Regulatory Economics, Morse, Richard, Weisenmiller & Associates, Inc.**April 1990 - April 1992**

Economic consulting and expert witness testimony, primarily in the fields of telecommunications and energy regulation.

California Public Utilities Commission**June 1984 - March 1990****Director, Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA)****March 1989 - March 1990**

Headed a staff of over 200 analysts who provided expert witness testimony on behalf of California ratepayers in contested proceedings involving telecommunications, electric, gas, water and transportation utilities. Major proceedings included evaluation of proposed merger between Southern California Edison and San Diego Gas and Electric Companies.

Program Manager, Energy Rate Design and Economics Branch, DRA**October 1987 - March 1989**

Managed a staff of over 30 analysts who testified on electric and gas rate design and costing issues, sales forecasts and productivity analyses. Testified as lead policy witness in electric utility incentive ratemaking and transportation policy proceedings.

Senior Policy Analyst, Policy and Planning Division**March 1987 - October 1987**Organized *en banc* hearing and drafted notice of investigation for major telecommunications incentive regulation proceeding. Headed Commission task force on open network architecture.**Commissioner's Advisor****July 1985 - March 1987**

Lead advisor on independent power industry and cost of capital issues. Analyzed proposed decisions on energy, telecommunications, water and transportation issues and made recommendations for Commission action. Co-authored Commission order establishing conditions for approval of San Diego Gas and Electric Company application to form a holding company.

Staff Economist, Public Staff Division**June 1984 - July 1985**

Testified on cost of capital and telecommunications bypass issues. Served on telecommunications strategy task force charged with developing recommendations for post-divestiture regulatory policies.

Instructor, Golden Gate University**1986 - 1987**

Taught courses on telecommunications regulation to students in the Masters in Telecommunications Management program and students in a special program for federal government telecommunications managers.

Acting Assistant Professor of Economics, Wesleyan University**July 1981 - June 1982**

Taught undergraduate courses in microeconomics, macroeconomics, econometrics, and economics and policy of regulation.

TESTIMONY**California Department of Insurance**

- File Nos. PA-94-0012-00 & PA-94-0012-0A, In re 20th Century Insurance Company and 21st Century Casualty Company.
- File Nos. PA-93-0014-00 *et al.*, In the Matter of the Rates and Rating Practices, and Rate Applications of: State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company, State Farm Fire and Casualty Company, State Farm General Insurance Company, Applicants and Respondents, 3/1/94, 3/29/94.
- File Nos. PA-93-0009-00 *et al.*, In the Matter of the Rate Applications of Nationwide Mutual Insurance Company, Nationwide Mutual Fire Insurance Company, Nationwide Property and Casualty Insurance Company, Applicants, 9/11/93.

California Public Utilities Commission

- A.98-12-005, In the Matter of the Joint Application of GTE Corporation ("GTE") and Bell Atlantic Corporation ("Bell Atlantic") to Transfer Control of GTE's California Utility Subsidiaries to Bell Atlantic Which Will Occur Indirectly as a Result of GTE's Merger with Bell Atlantic, 6/7/99.
- A.99-03-047, In the Matter of the Petition by Pacific Bell (U 1001 C) for Arbitration of an Interconnection Agreement with Metropolitan Fiber Systems/ Worldcom Technologies, Inc. (MFS/Worldcom) Pursuant to Section 252(b) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, 4/16/99, 5/24/99.
- A.98-05-038, In the Matter of the Application of Pacific Bell for Authority for Pricing Flexibility and to Increase Certain Operator Services, to Reduce the Number of Monthly Directory Assistance Call Allowances, and Adjust Prices for Four Centrex Optional Features, 11/17/98.
- A.98-06-052, In the Matter of the Petition of PDO Communications, Inc. for Arbitration Pursuant to Section 252 of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 to Establish an Interconnection Agreement with Pacific Bell, 8/14/98.
- Petition for Arbitration of MCI Telecommunications Corporation for an Interconnection Agreement with GTE California, Inc., 9/96.
- A.96-04-038, In the Matter of the Joint Application of Pacific Telesis Group and SBC Communications, Inc. for SBC to Control Pacific Bell, 9/30/96.

- A.93-03-054, Application to Modify Diablo Canyon Pricing and Adopt a Customer Electric Rate Freeze in Compliance with Decision 95-12-063, 9/9/96.
- R.93-04-003/I.93-04-002, Rulemaking and Investigation on the Commission's Own Motion to Govern Open Access to Bottleneck Services and Establish and Framework for Network Architecture Development of Dominant Carrier Networks, 6/14/96, 7/10/96, 3/18/97, 12/19/97, 2/11/98, 4/8/98, 4/27/98, 5/1/98, 6/5/98, 12/18/98, 1/11/99, 2/8/99.
- I.95-04-044, Order Instituting Investigation on the Commission's Own Motion into Competition for Local Exchange Service, 10/2/95, 10/9/95, 12/95.
- I.94-04-032, Order Instituting Investigation on the Commission's Proposed Policies Governing Restructuring California's Electric Services Industry and Reforming Regulation, 12/8/94.
- Application Nos. 93-05-008 *et al.*, In the Matter of the Application of Sierra Pacific Power Company to Authorize a Return on Equity for Calendar Year 1994 Pursuant to Attrition Rate Adjustment Mechanism, 8/93.
- Application Nos. 92-05-002 and 92-05-004, Application of GTE California Incorporated for Review of the Operations of the Incentive-Based Regulatory Framework Adopted in Decision 89-10-031, 5/93, 7/93.
- Case No. 91-12-028, The City of Long Beach, in its Proprietary Capacity and as Trustee for the State of California, Complainant, vs. Unocal California Pipeline Company, a Unocal Company, Defendant, 5/15/93.
- L87-11-033 *et al.*, In the Matter of Alternative Regulatory Frameworks for Local Exchange Carriers (Phase III, Implementation and Rate Design), 9/23/91, 12/16/91, 1/17/92.
- General freight deregulation proceeding, 10/88.
- I.86-10-001, Risk, Return and Ratemaking, 3/88.
- Southwest Gas General Rate Case, 8/85.
- Application No. 85-01-034, Pacific Bell Test Year 1986 General Rate Case, 4/22/85.
- CP National South Lake Tahoe Gas General Rate Case, 12/84.

Colorado Public Service Commission

- Docket No. 91A-480EG, In the Matter of the Joint Application of the Parties to Revised Settlement Agreement II in Docket Nos. 91S-091EG and 90F-226E for Commission Consideration of Decoupling Revenues from Sales and Establishment of Regulatory Incentives to Encourage the Implementation of DSM Programs, 11/8/91, 4/30/92, 9/8/92, 9/14/92.

Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control

- Petition for Arbitration of MCI Telecommunications Corporation for an Interconnection Agreement with The Southern New England Telephone Company, 12/96.
- Docket Nos. 95-06-17 *et al.*, Application of The Southern New England Telephone Company for Approval to Offer Unbundled Loops, Ports and Associated Interconnection Arrangements, 9/8/95.

Delaware Public Service Commission

- Docket No. 96-324, Bell Atlantic - Delaware Statement of Terms and Conditions Under Section 252(F) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, 2/4/97.
- Docket No. 45, In the Matter of the Development of Regulations for the Facilitation of Competitive Entry into the Telecommunications Local Exchange Service Market, 7/3/96.

District of Columbia Public Service Commission

- Formal Case No. 962, In the Matter of the Implementation of the District of Columbia Telecommunications Act of 1996 and Implementation of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Order No. 10916, 3/24/97, 5/2/97, 5/9/97.

Federal Communications Commission

- File No. E-98-12, MCI Telecommunications Corp. and MCImetro Access Transmission Services, Inc., Complainants, v. Bell Atlantic Corp., Defendant, 12/19/97, 3/25/98.
- CC Docket No. 94-1, In the Matter of Price Cap Performance Review for Local Exchange Carriers, 6/29/94.
- W-P-C 6913 *et al.*, In re the Matter of the Application of Pacific Bell for Authority Pursuant to Section 214 of the Communications Act of 1934, and Section 63.01 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations to Construct and Maintain Advanced Telecommunications Facilities to Provide Video Dialtone Services to Selected Communities.

Florida Public Service Commission

- Docket No. 990649-TP, In re: investigation into the pricing of unbundled network elements, 8/11/99, 9/10/99.
- Docket No. 930424-EI, In re: Request for Approval of Proposal for Incentive Return on Demand-Side Management Investments by Florida Power Corporation, 11/22/93.
- Docket No. 93-444-EI, In re: Request for Approval of Proposal for Revenue Decoupling by Florida Power Corporation, 11/22/93.

Hawaii Public Service Commission

- Docket No. 7702, In the Matter of Public Utilities Commission Instituting a Proceeding on Communications, Including an Investigation of the Communications Infrastructure of the State of Hawaii, 7/3/97, 8/29/97.

Illinois Commerce Commission

- Petition for Arbitration of MCI Telecommunications Corporation for an Interconnection Agreement with Ameritech - Illinois, 12/96.

Kansas Corporation Commission

- Docket No. 190, 192-U, In the Matter of a General Investigation into Competition within the Telecommunications Industry in the State of Kansas, 11/14/94.

Maryland Public Service Commission

- Docket No. 8797, In the Matter of The Potomac Edison Company's Proposed: (a) Stranded Cost Quantification Mechanism; (b) Price Protection Mechanism; (c) and Unbundled Rates, 1/26/99.
- Docket No. 8795, In the Matter of Delmarva Power and Light Company's Proposed Stranded Cost Quantification Mechanism, Price Protection Mechanism, and Unbundled Rates, 12/28/98.
- Docket No. 8794, In the Matter of Baltimore Gas and Electric (BGE)'s Proposed Stranded Cost Quantification Mechanism, Price Protection Mechanism, and Unbundled Rates, 12/22/98, 7/23/99, 8/3/99.
- Docket No. 8786, In the Matter of the Investigation of Non-Recurring Charges for Telecommunications Interconnection Service, 5/27/98, 11/16/98, 12/18/98.

- Docket No. 8731, Phase II, In the Matter of the Petitions for Approval of Agreements and Arbitration of Unresolved Issues Arising Under §252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, 3/7/97.
- Case No. 8731, In the Matter of the Petitions for Approval of Agreements and Arbitration of Unresolved Issues Arising under Section 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, 10/96.
- Case No. 8715, In the Matter of the Inquiry into Alternative Forms of Regulating Telephone Companies, 11/95, 4/1/96.

Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy

- Docket No. DTE 98-57, Investigation by the Department on its own motion as to the propriety of the rates and charges set forth in the following tariffs: M.D.T.E. Nos. 14 and 17, filed with the Department on April 2, 1999, to become effective May 2, 1999, by New England Telephone and Telegraph Company d/b/a Bell Atlantic – Massachusetts, 7/26/99.

Michigan Public Service Commission

- Case No. U-10755, In the Matter of the Application of Consumers Power Company for Authority to Increase Its Rates for the Sale of Natural Gas and for Other Relief, 6/9/95.
- Case No. U-10685, In the Matter of the Application of Consumers Power Company for Authority to Increase Its Rates for the Sale of Electricity, 3/29/95, 5/5/95.
- Case No. U-10647, In the Matter of the Application of City Signal, Inc., for an Order Establishing and Approving Interconnection Arrangements with Michigan Bell Telephone Company, 8/5/94, 11/7/94, 11/30/94.

Nevada Public Service Commission

- Docket No. 96-9035, In re a Petition by the Regulatory Operations Staff to Open an Investigation into the Procedures and Methodologies that Should Be Used to Develop Costs for Bundled or Unbundled Telephone Services or Service Elements in the State of Nevada, 5/8/97, 5/23/97.

New Jersey Board of Public Utilities

- Docket No. TX95120631, Notice of Investigation into Local Exchange Competition for Telecommunications Services, 8/30/96, 12/20/96.

New York Public Service Commission

- Case Nos. 94-E-0098 *et al.*, Niagara Mohawk Fuel Adjustment Clause Target and S.C. 6 Update Filing, 11/17/95.
- Case Nos. 93-E-0912 *et al.*, Proceeding on Motion of the Commission to Review Long-Run Avoided Cost Estimation Policies and Methods, 5/10/95, 5/31/95.
- Central Hudson Gas & Electric Company General Rate Case
- Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation General Rate Case
- Case Nos. 91-E-0863 *et al.*, New York State Electric & Gas Corporation General Rate Case, 1/92.
- Case Nos. 91-E-0765 *et al.*, Rochester Gas & Electric Corporation General Rate Case, 11/91.
- Case No. 91-E-0506, Central Hudson Gas & Electric Company General Rate Case, 9/91, 10/91.
- Case Nos. 29327 *et al.*, Niagara Mohawk General Rate Case, 3/91.
- Docket No. 89-E-176, In the Matter of the Proceeding on Motion of the Commission to Examine Ratemaking Practices and Incentive Mechanisms Promoting Least-Cost Planning and Demand-Side Management by Electric Utilities, 4/19/90, 5/4/90, 4/18/91, 6/20/91.

North Carolina Utilities Commission

- Docket Nos. P-7, Sub 825, and P-10, Sub 479, In the Matter of Petition of Carolina Telephone and Telegraph and Central Telephone Company for Approval of a Price Regulation Plan Pursuant to G. S. 62-133.5, 1/31/96.
- Docket No. P-55, Sub 1013, In the Matter of Application of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., for, and Election of, Price Regulation and Motion for a Hearing, 1/28/96, 2/1/96.

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission

- Docket Nos. P-00991648, Joint Application of NEXTLINK Pennsylvania, Inc., *et al.* and P-00991649, Joint Application of Bell Atlantic - Pennsylvania, Inc., *et al.*, 4/22/99, 6/11/99.
- Docket Nos. A-310200F0002 *et al.*, In re the Joint Application of Bell Atlantic Corporation and GTE Corporation for Approval of Agreement and Plan of Merger, 3/23/99; 5/19/99.
- Docket No. I-00960066, Generic Investigation of Intrastate Access Charge Reform, 6/30/97; 7/29/97; 8/27/97.
- Petition for Arbitration by MCI Communications Corporation for an Interconnection Agreement with Bell Atlantic - Pennsylvania, 9/96.
- Petition for Arbitration by AT&T-PA for an Interconnection Agreement with GTE-PA, 9/96.
- Petition for Arbitration by Eastern TeleLogic for an Interconnection Agreement with Bell Atlantic - Pennsylvania, 9/96.
- Petition for Arbitration by AT&T-PA for an Interconnection Agreement with Bell Atlantic - Pennsylvania, 9/96.
- Docket No. I-940035, Formal Investigation to Examine and Establish Updated Universal Service Principles and Policies for Telecommunications Services, 1/11/96, 2/14/96, 2/27/96.
- Docket No. A-310203F002, Application of MFS Intelenet of Pennsylvania, Inc., for Approval to Operate as a Local Exchange Telecommunications Company, 1/30/95, 2/22/96, 3/22/96, 1/13/97, 2/97.

South Carolina Public Service Commission

- Docket No. 95-720-C, Application of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. d/b/a Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company for Alternative Regulation, 8/21/95, 9/11/95.
- Docket No. 95-862-C, Re: BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. d/b/a Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company Investigation of Level of Earnings, 8/21/95, 9/11/95.

Texas Public Utility Commission

- Docket Nos. 20226, Petition of Accelerated Connections, Inc. d/b/a ACI Corp. for Arbitration to Establish an Interconnection Agreement with Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, and 20272, Petition of DIECA Communications, Inc., d/b/a Covad Communications Company for Arbitration of Interconnection Rates, Terms and Conditions and Related Arrangements with Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, 2/19/99, 4/8/99.

Vermont Public Service Board

- Docket No. 5780, Green Mountain Power Company General Rate Case, 1/13/95.
- Docket No. 5695, Green Mountain Power Company General Rate Case, 1/94.

Virginia State Corporation Commission

- Petitions for Arbitration of AT&T-VA and MCI Communications Corporation for an Interconnection Agreement with Bell Atlantic - Virginia, 9/20/96.
- Petition for Arbitration of AT&T-VA for an Interconnection Agreement with GTE-VA, 8/96, 10/29/96.

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission

- Docket No. UT-960639 *et al.*, Phase II, In the Matter of the Pricing Proceeding for Interconnection, Unbundled Elements, Transport and Termination, and Resale, 8/20/98, 9/11/98.
- Docket No. UT-950200, Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission vs. U S WEST Communications, Inc., 8/28/95, 12/15/95.
- Docket No. UT-941464 *et al.*, Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission vs. U S WEST Communications, Inc., 4/17/95, 5/31/95.
- Docket No. UT-911488 *et al.*, Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission vs. U S WEST Communications, Inc.

Wisconsin Public Service Commission

- Petition for Arbitration of MCI Telecommunications Corporation for an Interconnection Agreement with Ameritech - Wisconsin, 12/96.

Civil Proceedings

- Nationwide Business Telephones and Team Centrex, Plaintiffs, vs. Introlink Communication Systems, Inc., Pacific Bell, Inc., *et al.*, Defendants, 5/96.
- Power Producers v. Pacific Gas & Electric, 6/93.
- WindTec, Inc. v. Southern California Edison Company, 7/90.

Education

A.B., Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio. Major: Economics. National Merit Scholar, recipient of Hanson Prize in Economics, elected to Phi Beta Kappa.

M.A., M.Phil., Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut. Economics. Admitted to Ph.D. candidacy and completed all Ph.D. requirements except dissertation. Fields of specialization included industrial organization and energy and environmental economics. Honorable mention, National Science Foundation Fellowship; recipient of University Fellowship and Sloan Foundation dissertation research fellowship.

Attachment TLM-2

BA-NY Submission to September 15, 1999, Collaborative Meeting

Freeing up copper facilities

When a "no facilities" condition is encountered on a loop order, there is a hierarchy of activities that BA will perform in order to attempt to free up facilities. This hierarchy is used in BA Retail and is also used in BA Wholesale when Unbundled loops are requested. There are several steps in this hierarchy that are inappropriate activities when an unbundled loop order is being provisioned, mainly on xDSL types of requests. For example, one of the steps in this hierarchy is to assign a Digital Access Main Line (DAML). This would not be an appropriate solution to free up facilities on a 2W ADSL qualified loop request, for example, because ADSL will not work over a DAML which is considered to be electronics.

The steps that BA NY will go through to find alternate facilities as part of the assignment/provisioning process are shown in the table below. The steps that are transparent to the CLEC and done at no additional charge are identified in the description below the table. In addition, those steps that require CLEC notification and approval due to charges that are assessed if the work activity is performed in addition to longer intervals that may be required are identified below as well.

Provisioning Table

The intent of this table is to illustrate the standard Corporate process flow for processing an order when an outside plant facility is not available at the assignment stage of the provisioning process.

	<i>2W Analog Retail/Wholesale</i>		<i>2W Digital (ADSL) Retail/Wholesale</i>		<i>2W Digital Premium (ISDN) Retail/Wholesale</i>	
<i>Alternate Facilities</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>
<i>CF</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>
<i>BCT</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>
<i>LST</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>
<i>WOL</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>
<i>CDP</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>
<i>DAML</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>
<i>TOV</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>
<i>Special Construction /Other</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>

BA has worked into its provisioning process the items in the hierarchy that are possible and applicable on unbundled loops, more specifically, on xDSL qualified loops. As shown by the table above, if facilities are not available in the pre-qualification process for BA Retail ADSL requests, the end user is notified that facilities are not available and ADSL is not provisioned. Where possible and when feasible, BA performs these steps in the provisioning/assignment process for a CLEC/DLEC, requesting a xDSL compatible loop in order to free up facilities.

Table Explanation:

Alternate Spare facilities: If an alternate spare facility can be verified good to the serving terminal, the service will be provisioned and the service order completed. This step is transparent to the end user or to the CLEC. Charges are not assessed.

CF – Connected Facility. 2nd or 3rd line to location which is not in use is freed up. This step is transparent to the end user or to the CLEC. Charges are not assessed.

BCT – Break Cut Through Facility (Normally date sensitive). This arrangement involves a facility that is dedicated to a particular location. Normally the pair remains dedicated when premises vacated for next occupant. If facilities are needed, these facilities can be made available after a certain period of time, however, this leaves the premises where the facilities were taken from in a “no facilities” situation. This step is transparent to the end user or to the CLEC. Charges are not assessed.

LST – Line and Station Transfer/Pair Swaps. Line and station transfers or pair swaps are considered in order to free up facilities. Line and station transfers are not done in BA Retail to free up facilities for BA Retail ADSL service; the end user request is turned back as “no facilities” available. LSTs are done for CLECs/DLECs, and because they involve multiple scenarios, incur charges, and require longer intervals, the CLECs/DLECs are made aware of these transfers/swaps.

BA NY will perform a pair swap (DLC to copper) which involves moving an existing customer served on DLC onto copper, where copper is available, in order to provision a xDSL loop to a CLEC/DLEC's end user. This work will be done in the normal provisioning process and is transparent to the CLEC. Charges are not assessed.

BA NY will perform a pair swap (copper to copper) of cable pairs when BA NY must move a customer's existing service to another pair in order to support the requested service transmission parameters or must move a jumper in order to free up a spare at a different terminal. This involves

additional I&M work, requires the approval of the CLEC/DLEC, requires a different interval; additional charges are billed.

BA NY will perform a pair swap (copper to DLC) which involves moving an existing customer served on copper to DLC to free up the copper. In this situation, BA will move an analog customer off copper onto DLC in order to free up copper for a xDSL loop order. This work activity includes work at a cross-box and also involves moving a jumper. This requires additional I&M work, requires the approval of the CLEC/DLEC, requires a different interval; additional charges are billed.

WOL – Wire out of limits. This work is done when the only free facilities are not located on the one that would normally serve the end user location. (generally when the only free facilities are on the adjacent terminal in either direction). This requires the placement of a drop. This work is transparent to the end user or CLEC. Charges are not assessed.

CDP – Clear Defective Pair. This option is utilized for POTS single line service, it is not used for designed or multi-line service orders nor for terminals associated with a Pair Gain System (Litespan, Universal, or Integrated). Clearing defective pairs involves significantly more work than the other options. This step may require longer intervals and additional charges may be assessed.

DAML – Additional Main Line. This work is done in areas where there is a shortage of facilities. Because this option includes adding physical equipment to the loop which acts as electronics, this option is not feasible for xDSL loop requests. In the case of an analog loop, this work is transparent to the end user or CLEC. Charges are not assessed.

TOV – Remove an overaged Left in Dial Tone Line. (Date sensitive.) This work is transparent to the end user or CLEC. Charges are not assessed.

Special Construction/other – Special construction or other “options” may be available in several situations. BA Retail – 2W Digital ISDN – if a BA Retail end user requests ISDN, and it is currently not provisioned out of the central office which normally serves the end user, a “re-home” may be possible. This option allows the ISDN service to be provisioned out of an

CLEC Requirements:

On the majority of the work activities identified above, CLEC/DLEC action is not required. CLEC/DLEC action is required on pair swaps and on requests to add electronics to a 2W Digital ISDN loop (i.e., Digital Designed Loop request).

Pair Swap:*

Step 1: The CLEC electronically submits an order for 2W ADSL (for example).

Step 2: The TISOC receives the CLEC request; processes necessary paperwork for a loop qualification to be performed. This documentation is sent to the appropriate BA work group.

Step 3: A MLT test is performed. In addition, BA NY checks for available facilities.

If facilities are found, and the loop qualifies, the TISOC sends a FOC (Firm Order Confirmation) to the CLEC/DLEC. The loop is provisioned within the standard interval.

If facilities are not found, the loop qualification request is forwarded to BA Engineering. BA Engineering will attempt to find facilities including the possibility of a swap.

If all attempts at freeing up a copper facility fail, BA Engineering will advise the TISOC. The TISOC will query the CLEC/DLEC and request a cancellation of the order. The CLEC/DLEC cancels order.

If a swap is possible, BA Engineering will inform the TISOC.

Step 4: The TISOC will query the CLEC/DLEC that a Pair Swap or Line Station Transfer is possible and requests further direction from the CLEC/DLEC.

Step 5: The CLEC may cancel the request.

The CLEC, via a sup to the original order, request that BA proceed with the work required in order to free up a copper facility.

The TISOC will inform BA Engineers to proceed with the

requested work. A FOC will be returned to the CLEC/DLEC with an extended date due. The order will be provisioned.

Step 6: A separate bill will be produced for the work performed.

- *Process flow diagram available.*

2W Digital ISDN Electronics:

Step 1: The CLEC electronically submits an order for 2W Digital ISDN loop with ISDN electronics. (A unique NC/NCI code is used on the electronic order when this is requested.)

Step 2: The TISOC receives the CLEC request; sends request to BA Engineering.

Step 3: If the copper portion of the facility is confirmed to be over 18k ft, the request for ISDN electronics will be processed.

Step 4: The CLEC/DLEC request is forwarded to BA Engineering. BA Engineering will process an engineering work order and will forward to BA construction.

Step 5: Construction work will be performed. This process may take up to 18 days (including the work performed by BA Engineering and all construction work); a FOC will be returned to the CLEC/DLEC after the construction work has been done. The order will be provisioned.

Step 6: A separate bill will be produced for the work performed.